

## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

### The Word Is Treason . . . .

So certain and so rapid has now become the succession of world-shaking events, of crisis on top of crisis, that the memory of the American people concerning earlier crises has become even shorter than it was before. There is one important result, of this obliteration of impressions by ever new and heavier impressions, on which Eisenhower's Communist bosses have counted with assurance. As each new development on the Cold War front takes place, the American people are stuffed to the gills with arguments, in infinite detail, as to why the President did this or did not do that, and are set to debating with each other as to the soundness or wisdom of every piecemeal action or statement of the administration -- with all such arguments and grounds for debate carefully pitched on the foundation that the administration is seeking the best possible course for bringing about the ultimate defeat of Communism. Only as any one major development begins to recede enough in perspective, so that the American people could look at it whole, is there any real chance of widespread suspicion arising that the whole premise, on which the battle of opinions has been fought, was fraudulent in the first place. But by that time a new development has turned the attention of the public once again on the tweedledum-against-tweedledee controversies connected with the new crisis. Yet it is only by getting outside, away from the individual trees and the underbrush, that there is any chance of seeing a woods correctly; and the only way we

have of quickly grasping the nature and important features of any new woods we may find ourselves in at a particular time is by recalling what we have learned from similar experiences in the past. So let's look back, very briefly, at just a few of these "woods" we have recently been through.

Who, for instance, is paying any attention today to the International Atomic Energy Agency, about which there was so much shouting only two years ago? Yet the sell-out of this country's interests and safety to the Communists, which Eisenhower engineered through that scheme, is far more obvious today than it was then. The Agency grew out of a proposal which Eisenhower personally made to the United Nations in 1953. The Charter creating the Agency was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in October, 1956. In due course that Charter, in the form of a treaty, was then presented to the United States Senate.

As some concern and indignation did arise over this monstrous betrayal, Eisenhower began making his customary claims of astonishment on discovering some of the features of the treaty -- exactly as he did with regard to provisions of his own "civil rights" bill. In this case, however, the hypocrisy was carried even further. For at the very time Eisenhower was expressing pious surprise at some of the terms of the Charter, his associates were shouting that the Senate must accept it for the explicit reason that this whole plan was President Eisenhower's own idea. (Of course nobody brought forth the fact that helping Russia to get its hands on more nuclear fuels has been an obsession with Eisenhower ever since he took such pains in 1945 to see that Soviet troops got possession of the Czechoslovakian Uranium mines.) In July, 1957, the treaty was ratified -- and promptly forgotten.

It shouldn't have been. Any member of the United Nations is automatically eligible to join the International Atomic Energy Agency. Any country, such as Red China, although not a member of the United Nations, may be taken into the Agency by a two-thirds vote of those nations that are already members. Russia almost burned out a bearing in its haste to set the example of ratification. Some eighty other nations had already joined or signified their intention of joining before we did. But the Agency meant nothing until the United States joined, since sharing our atomic materials and knowledge was the reason for its existence. We now pay one-third of the cost of running the outfit (besides supplying all of the nuclear fuel for it to manage), but have only one vote in eighty concerning its management. The head of the Agency today is a Czechoslovakian Communist.

Eisenhower had already committed us in advance to membership, as far as he dared, by his statement of November 18, 1956 (immediately after the elections) as follows: "It will be our policy ..... to seek to conduct our operations in support of nuclear power development abroad in consonance with the policy of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in whose endeavors we shall take our full part." On October 23, 1956 he had sent a telegram to the conference which was drafting the Agency's statute, as follows: "The United States will make available to the International Agency, on terms to be agreed with the Agency, 5000 kilograms of the nuclear fuel, Uranium-235, from the 20,000 kilograms allocated last February by the United States for peaceful uses by friendly nations." And even before we had joined, the Atomic Energy Commission was using the Agency as an excuse for sharing our knowledge, by declassifying information of considerable value in the production of fissionable material.

Practically all of the nuclear scientists have stated

that there is no clear line between the production of such materials for power development and its production for bombs. The Agency has no control over what its member nations do with the nuclear fuel allotted to them out of the pool we provide. According to the charter of the Agency we could be obligated by the Agency to deliver our fissionable material directly to such nations as Yugoslavia, Russia, or even Red China. And responsible authorities say that the 20,000 kilograms of U-235, which we were committed from the beginning to put into the pool, would make enough atomic bombs to wipe out every major city in America.

By the original terms of this commitment, our contribution of the remaining fifteen thousand kilograms of that twenty thousand was contingent on the same amount being contributed by all of the other nations of the world combined. But the President could modify that condition at any time. (He may already have. Once the Senate ratified the Charter, this Agency did a clever disappearing act from the pages of American newspapers.) Or he could cause delivery to be made by ourselves on the mere promise of delivery by other nations. Or Russia could actually put fifteen thousand kilograms into the pool, to match ours, and the Agency could then simply -- and perfectly legally -- turn the whole thirty thousand kilograms over to Russia. The only single safeguard against that whole lot, or any amount allocated by the Agency to any nation at any time, being used to produce bombs, is the "treaty" with those nations which constituted the Agency's charter.

There is not one treaty with any non-Communist nation which Russia has lived up to since the Communists came to power in that country. But Eisenhower urgently insisted that we put our necks into this noose, in reliance on the Russian promise not to monkey with the rope. The whole insidious scheme, to wipe

out the one military advantage over Russia which we still had, and to put the power to destroy us right into Communist hands, was variously described -- even by those who opposed it -- as an exercise in starry-eyed idealism; or as a premature and incautious play in world politics; or as simply unsurpassable folly. Frankly, we do not believe it was any of those things. We think it was camouflaged but deliberate treason; and that the camouflage consisted primarily of our unwillingness to use the senses God gave us and look squarely at plain facts.

Despite the small amount of space we gave to so large a subject as foreign aid, we are not going to plunge again into that wild blue yonder. But we do want to take a quick squint, from the point of view of this chapter, at one or two little clouds in that sky which have now floated off in the distance.

Incredible enough was Eisenhower's early and ardent championing of a loan by us to Gomulka's government of Poland. This insistence could not be justified by any naive belief in Gomulka's "nationalism" and independence of Moscow, because Eisenhower had been equally insistent on establishing the "Chair of Polish Studies" at Columbia, when no such excuse was even suggested. But nobody, at all informed on the situation, could possibly believe the "independence" myth anyway, for many reasons. We'll cite just two.

It was stated right in the arrangements for the forty-five million dollar "loan" that five million dollars of this money was to be used for equipment to increase Poland's deliveries of coal to Soviet Russia -- on which tributary deliveries Poland had fallen behind. It was perfectly clear that the Kremlin was not only helping Gomulka to get this money, in every way that it could, but was telling Gomulka exactly

what to do with it, to help Soviet Russia the most, when he got it.

Also, at the very time of the successful negotiations for this loan, Gomulka's government was itself extending loans and credit to Ho Chi Minh, to strengthen the Communist grip of that Moscow agent in Indo-china. In other words, Big Soviet Brother Russia was giving Little Soviet Brother Poland the pride and prestige of itself being big brother to a still smaller child of the Soviet family -- namely Ho Chi Minh's government in North Vietnam. There is no other possible reason why a financially hard pressed Poland should be giving handouts to a small Communist regime on the other side of the world, with which it had no historic affiliation whatsoever, except that the whole maneuver was ordered by Moscow to promote solidarity within the Communist family and for other propaganda purposes. And to carry out these purposes required only a small slice of the money which we ourselves were providing Communist Poland. Once again Eisenhower's action did not even make sense, except as a means of helping the Communists in their worldwide plans.

Equally incredible was Eisenhower's enthusiasm for handing out additional hundreds of millions of dollars to Nehru in support of India's Second Five-Year Plan, when the very plan he was boasting had been drawn up by P. C. Malanobis and Oscar Lange. Mr. Lange had left the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1945, renounced his American citizenship, and become a high official of the Communist government of Poland -- which he still is. Professor Malanobis' loyalty to the Kremlin is equally clear. Yet Eisenhower was eager to have these men decide how huge sums of American money were to be spent -- supposedly to make India less vulnerable to Communism!

But we would be willing to rest our case, as to what the whole mountain of foreign-aid evidence proves about Eisenhower's real purposes, before any honest jury which had not been completely hypnotized, on just one thin string of that evidence. And that is his continued and unshakable determination, supported by all of the power of the presidency, to keep right on sending military supplies to Tito. We have already reminded our readers of the way Eisenhower not only defied Congress, in the fall of 1956, with regard to aid to Yugoslavia, but converted that defiance into a marvelous piece of propaganda for the Communists. What we wish to emphasize here is that military aid to Tito has been one of Eisenhower's personal pet projects for years; a project which, but for Eisenhower's unceasing and aggressive backing, would have been dropped long ago.

The best that could ever be said of aid to Tito, the murderous Communist tyrant of an enslaved people, was that it was supreme folly. But even that "admission against interest" became idiotic by the summer of 1956. For in June of that year Tito spent three weeks in Moscow as a guest of the Kremlin. At the end of that visit he and Zhukov signed joint communiques announcing that their governments stood shoulder to shoulder for various causes dearest to the Kremlin's heart, including the unification of Germany by "negotiations" rather than by free elections, and the handing of Formosa over to Red China. Tito awarded Zhukov Yugoslavia's highest decoration, The Order Of Freedom (no fooling, that's what they call it); and Zhukov stated, with Tito's full approval, that in any future war their two countries would fight shoulder to shoulder "for the well-being of mankind."

Since that time, while Tito has of course gone through some of his usual off-again on-again mouthings about his independence of Moscow, in reality he

has openly and continuously acted as the Kremlin's ally and agent, guiding Nasser, Nehru, and others according to Communist instructions. He is not only irrevocably our enemy, as he always has been; but any pretense that he is not a part of the top Moscow Communist hierarchy has become ridiculous. Yet in May, 1957, after a short interlude caused by Congressional awareness of these obvious facts, the State Department announced plans to resume shipments of military aid, including jet planes, to Tito; and further announced that this was with the specific approval of President Eisenhower. Shortly thereafter Eisenhower emphatically reaffirmed that such shipments would be continued. They were, to the tune of some fifty-five million dollars' worth of military equipment during the fall of 1957, with special attention to jet planes. The shipments are still being continued today.

During Eisenhower's tenure of office the United States has "invested" nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars (on top of all other aid to Tito) to arm the Yugoslav Communists. The Yugoslav army now has twenty-eight divisions, eight of which have been wholly equipped by the United States -- to help overrun Western Europe on the ground whenever the Kremlin is ready. But the proportion of United States equipment in the Yugoslav Air Force is immensely higher. Almost all of Tito's combat-worthy planes have been given him, by us -- which really means by Eisenhower. This arming of a known enemy with our military equipment could not be any more clearly of treasonous intent if the planes were being delivered direct to Moscow. It is sheer hallucination to regard it in any other light.

Professor Slobodan Draskovich says, and proves, in his book, TITO, MOSCOW'S TROJAN HORSE: "To promote Titoism for the sake of world conquest

by the Communists makes sense. To promote Titoism for the sake of freedom does not." Frankly, we believe that Eisenhower fully agrees with Draskovich. We believe that he insists on sending military aid, especially jet planes, to Tito, specifically because it does help the Communists in their plans for world conquest. And we believe that the reader, if he will be honest with himself, cannot even find any other plausible explanation.

Eisenhower has waged an unrelenting campaign to break down our immigration laws, and nullify our immigration restrictions, in order to increase the flood of aliens now pouring across our borders. And the criminal and subversive part of this flood, just from what is actually known, is enough to make any American's hair stand on end.

Eisenhower's program -- like so many of his other activities -- is a continuation and expansion of one begun under the Communist-dominated Truman administration. Since 1948 we have legally received into this country, under three special laws pushed through for that purpose, four hundred thousand "displaced persons" and two hundred thousand "refugees," in addition to our normal quota of immigrants. How many of them have been Communists there is no way of guessing with any reasonable accuracy. Any man who tried to do a conscientious and proper screening job, in admitting these immigrants, has been either discharged or transferred. (As Almanzo Tripp, Robert C. Alexander, and others will gladly testify.) Eisenhower's urgent recommendations, if followed, would now be adding at least 378,000 -- Congressman Francis E. Walter estimates 500,000 -- immigrants annually to the influx provided by the Walter-McCarren Act. How many of these would be Communists can be surmised only from the pressure by Communist fronts to get

Eisenhower's proposals adopted.

As the July 15, 1957 Bulletin of the Southern States Industrial Council pointed out, the study and preparation that went into the Walter-McCarren Act were the most extensive, and over the longest period of time, ever devoted to a single piece of legislation by the American Congress. The Act became law, over the Communist-dictated veto of President Truman, on June 26, 1952, by a vote of 278 to 113 in the House and 57 to 26 in the Senate.

Prior to that time, our immigration laws and naturalization policy were not coordinated, and our whole program for admitting immigrants was a snarl of separately enacted and conflicting statutes. The Walter-McCarren Act straightened out the conflicts, cleared away many injustices, carefully made humanitarian provision for emergencies, and put our whole procedure on a generous but sensible basis. It is an excellent law -- to everybody except those who wish to admit enough Communists to form a fifth column large enough to help mightily in our destruction.

But the Communists don't like it. They call it "fascist," "racist," and all the other smear names they can devise. The House Un-American Activities Committee disclosed in the spring of 1957 that the Communists had created more than 180 fronts for the specific purpose of bringing about "grass roots" pressure on Congress to destroy the Walter-McCarren Act. Today they have more than 200 organizations on this assignment. And leading the pack of these would-be destroyers, with his idealistic-sounding subterfuges and his unceasing "emergency" proposals, is Dwight D. Eisenhower. Congressman Walter himself said, specifically of these attempts to punch fatal holes in the Walter-McCarren Act, that "the pressure from the White House is stronger than any I have seen in my twenty-one years in Congress and by far the most

effective."

(Let us call attention, in passing, to the recurrence of this same description of White House pressure, by different Congressmen and Senators in connection with entirely different pieces of legislation. Eisenhower has a diligently earned reputation for being gentle, lackadaisical, even indifferent about much that goes on around him, and ready to compromise tolerantly and generously with views that differ from his own. But let any matter come up in which the Communists are vitally concerned! Then the legislators involved, separately and repeatedly, report that the "White House pressure" on them, always to go along in the direction desired by the Communists, is the greatest they have ever known. This is just as true whether the issue be the Bricker Amendment, Foreign Aid, or Immigration.)

Another quotation from Congressman Walter, our country's greatest authority on the immigration problem and on legislation connected with it, is also well worth noting. On Monday, February 11, 1957, the United Press reported a statement made by Walter, the day before, in a radio debate with Senator Jacob K. Javits. The Congressman had said that, of the Hungarian refugees admitted to the United States, the first 6200 had all been Communists, including some secret police agents; and that the United States Refugee Relief Administration had taken 6200 visa numbers, belonging to "real refugees" from Europe, assigned those numbers to these Hungarian Communists, and thus provided for their permanent lawful residence in this country. Some of us, including this writer, had been saying in print that this was happening, weeks before Congressman Walter gave such official confirmation. Nor is there the least doubt that thousands of the other Hungarian "refugees" admitted, with so much fanfare made over them, were also Communists. And

it will be easily remembered that it was Eisenhower who made more and louder "humanitarian" noises, about rushing all of these "refugees" to our shores, than any other man in America.

If Madame Roland were living today, she could amend her famous lament to "Humanitarianism -- what treason is committed in thy name!" For on top of the speciously legalized flood of immigrants of suspicious character, the influx of illegal entrants is even worse. The Communists went diligently to work, with their usual organized fronts, on both methods of massive infiltration, in the early 1930's. We have now reached the point that, on the soldest authority, from three to five million unnaturalized aliens are illegally within our borders. Nothing is being done about them, and the Eisenhower administration, largely through Max Rabb, made it clear that it will "get" anybody who tries to do anything about them. In New York City alone, in just one recent year, the files on between fifty and seventy-five thousand illegal aliens were stamped "Closed" and simply stored away. Today the streams of such aliens, known to contain a large proportion of subversives, are pouring in on us in ever greater volume, from Canada, from Cuba, from Mexico, and from other sources. And not even an honest and patriotic member of the Immigration Service could do anything to stop even the most notorious subversive from entering.

We'll pause for one quick illustration, just to substantiate that last point. There are known to be at least fifty thousand Communists in Havana alone. And in the district office of the Immigration Service in Miami you will find, on any visit, dozens of files on Communist agents whom that office knows to be enroute to America, from or through Cuba, at that very time -- in order to enter the United States il-

legally and remain here. But the Immigration Service cannot intercept a single one. Why? Because Eisenhower's State Department has waived -- for more than two years now -- all documentation for all persons coming to this country from Cuba, if they claim they are coming for less than twenty-nine days. On being asked about this ruling, the State Department explained: "The law says we may waive documentation in certain emergency cases so we gave a blanket order." "But," the State Department was then asked, "What is the emergency to justify the waiver?" They replied: "The emergency is the terrific pressure we are under to get people into the United States." And that pressure stemmed right back to Max Rabb, using all of Eisenhower's power and prestige, with Eisenhower's full knowledge and consent.

Actually, the breakdown of our whole immigration barrier and screening service, for the visible purpose of letting Communists pour in, is so brazen and so nearly incredible that we cannot begin to present the matter properly in the space available here. Again, a whole book is needed. But for anybody who wishes to get at least some inkling of the treason involved in this area, right through the Truman administration and then increasingly under Eisenhower, we recommend a speech made by Mr. Richard C. Arens, Staff Director of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on April 18, 1957. Its sheer recital of facts will, or should, chill your spine. It will also go far to explain how the Communists now control enough numerical voting strength in this country, as a marginal body which they can influence to go in either direction (or both directions at once, as in 1956), to bring off the miraculous stunts that have been puzzling the analysts out of their sleep ever since Truman was reelected. (For a shocking confirmation of the growing Communist influence in our elections, please note that in the

California primaries a couple of months ago 425,000 votes were cast for a known Communist as a candidate for an important state office!) Any conservative or anti-Communist politician in America today is having to face not only the honestly Democratic or "liberal" voters in his constituency, but a sizable bloc -- depending on the area -- of controlled votes that are not amenable to reason or arguments of any kind. That the Eisenhower State Department and its Immigration Service are deliberately and constantly increasing this bloc is common and public knowledge to everybody who has studied the plain facts. That Eisenhower personally is fully aware of this program, and is its chief supporter, is the plain fact that we wish to make clear here.

For six years Eisenhower and his associates have carried on a persistent and energetic campaign to break down the independent sovereignty of the United States, and to submerge that sovereignty under international agreements and the control of international agencies. The open boasts of the United Nations crowd -- as in the book, Revolution On East River, by James Avery Joyce -- that there is a day-by-day de facto surrender of American sovereignty to the UN, are well justified. And Eisenhower's support of this transfer of sovereignty by installments is continuous. He has emphasized over and over, for instance, that our troops are to be used, in implementation of the Eisenhower Doctrine, under the control of the United Nations Security Council.

In that Council we have one vote in eleven; Russia has a veto power over everything it doesn't like; and the United Nations Secretary for Security Council Affairs, who would have the most direct control of any such troops, has been either a Russian Communist or a Polish Communist ever since the United Nations

was founded. Also today, since a smooth, clever, and quiet "reorganization" of the inner workings of the UN was put through about four years ago, it is administratively almost completely under the thumbs of a triumvirate consisting of Dag Hammarskjöld, Ralph Bunche, and a Soviet "diplomat," Ilya S. Tchernychev. The whole Secretariat and administrative staff below them consists almost entirely of people of the same stripe. Yet, right while this is being written, Eisenhower is doing his utmost to put into the hands of this group our prestige, our interests, and the command of our armed forces, in the Middle East. We are supposed to be fighting Communist aggression there, but Eisenhower will see that we turn over to these same Communists the control of everything we do in the fight.

In this connection the drive to put our money also, as well as our troops, under the command of this same body is worth noting. Two of Eisenhower's favorite lieutenants, Harold Stassen and Christian A. Herter, have spent much time in building up the arguments and working on public opinion to have us spread our foreign aid to all of the world under a new dispensation. Either we must enter into a partnership with Russia, whereby benevolent Russia and rich America together help to "develop the underdeveloped nations" -- which is the exact plan Earl Browder set forth for the future, in 1944; or we must contribute the money first to a United Nations pool, and let the United Nations then allocate our aid to the have-not nations, according to its superior wisdom and more impartial approach. Herter began plugging this Browder line months before he was taken into the Department of State. And while, fortunately for the United States, Childe Harold seems at present to be a lost cause, Eisenhower will find plenty of other helpers in his steady whittling away of America's substance and sovereignty, for

this purpose and many others.

As one means to that end Eisenhower has entered into more than four hundred so-called "Executive Agreements," all of them completely by-passing Congress, and many of them committing this country to obligations and aims of which even a supine Congress would never have approved. And most of these agreements Eisenhower was able to put into effect, unhindered and uncriticized, simply because not enough members of either the Congress or the public ever heard of them at all.

There are many other ways in which Eisenhower has gradually been putting his official weight more openly on the side of International Communism. But we'll make one illustration of these other ways suffice here. This instance came a few months after the Summit Conference. He forced on our National Security Council a formal policy of encouraging satellite governments to "maintain military alliances" with the Soviet. We'll let the intensely pro-Eisenhower Christian Science Monitor tell the story:

"It was recognized that if the 'spirit of Geneva' was to lead to a safer and easier relationship between Washington and Moscow, Washington would have to renounce any encouragement to movements in Eastern Europe which in any way could appear in Moscow's eyes as a threat to its security.

"On the basis of these assumptions the National Security Council, under the leadership of the President himself, decided to take a truly extraordinary step. It framed a policy under which the United States actually would encourage the governments of Eastern Europe to remain the military allies of the Soviet Union."

"Extraordinary" was the right word. This policy, stripped of all the specious dialectics used to disguise it, and looked at through glasses not clouded by the

mists of Communist doubletalk, has just one objective: To make the whole Soviet System more closely knit, less vulnerable to revolt, and more powerful as an enemy of ourselves. And please note that this huge victory for the Kremlin was obtained "under the leadership of the President himself."

Of course the material for this chapter is endless, but the patience of our readers is not. While we believe, therefore, that a thorough investigation of such crises and affairs as those identified by "Little Rock," "Sputnik," "NATO Paris Conference," and many others, would reveal Eisenhower's hand at work in every case, skillfully aiding Communist aims, we are simply going to indicate the direction a very few of those investigations might take, as briefly as we can.

A most interesting subject for detailed study would be Eisenhower's role in connection with the segregation storm in the South; his part in bringing about that storm, in subtly promoting its increasing violence, and in steering it towards the ultimate objective of his Communist bosses who planned the whole thing far in advance. ✓ This writer, in a six-thousand word article published two years ago, pointed out that the whole "civil rights" program and slogan in America today were just as phony as were the "agrarian reform" program and slogan of the Communists in China twenty years ago; and that they were being used by the same people, in the same way, for exactly the same purpose -- of creating little flames of civil disorder which could be fanned and coalesced into the huge conflagration of civil war.

The real "activists" and inciters on both sides of the issue don't care any more about actual Negro "rights" than they do about growing mushrooms on the moon. What they want is the bitterness, strife, and the results of that strife -- such as the acceptance

of the use of federal troops to put down local "rebellion" -- which can be brought about by urging both sides to resistance and violence. The whole program in America, from its strong but deceptive appeal to the idealistic, to the ruthless utilization of conflicting human emotions to create a maximum of trouble, is remarkably similar to the one carried out in China. This program is of too typical a Communist pattern, in every thread, for it not to have been woven by Communist hands from the beginning. And Eisenhower's central responsibility for inaugurating and carrying forward this program is too clear for argument. But for any more detailed analysis of the strategy and tactics employed by Eisenhower and his Communist bosses in this scheme, we shall have to refer any interested reader to the article mentioned above.

It is now well-established that several of the largest foundations in the United States are operating under directives "so to change the economic and political structure of this country that it can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union," or to that effect. From the time when the Institute of Pacific Relations, using \$2,600,000 of the money of these foundations, was so important a factor in the betrayal of China to the Communists, right up to the support by these foundations of trouble-making agencies in the South today, they have been extremely powerful influences, at work, in a hundred different ways, on behalf of International Communism.

When the Reece Committee set out, however, to expose the tremendous support of Communist activities by the foundations, it was Representative Hays who, by such antics and obstructionism as have never been witnessed in any other hearings of a Congressional Committee, made it literally impossible for the Reece Committee to do its job at all. And Hays boasted that

he was acting on behalf of the White House, with Eisenhower's personal blessing.

As to Sputnik, we would begin with a hundred pages to substantiate Igor Gouzenko's flat assertion that the combination of spying and treason was more responsible than all other factors combined for the Soviet exploit in the earth satellites race. We think that, even from what is known, we could convince any open-minded American that the Soviets were kept well informed of everything we had; and that our own launching of an earth satellite was deliberately held back for years to enable Russia to launch one first.

With that established, we would then begin the look at Eisenhower's part in the whole deal, with the following transcript from a Congressional committee hearing as a starting point.

Senator Symington: "Mr. Lamphier, I think .... .... the so-called ballistic missile was started in 1946 and canceled in 1947 when the Army Air Corps was part of the Army ..... Is that correct?"

Mr. Lamphier: "Yes, sir. We checked the records before we came and it was July of 1947."

Senator Symington: "At which time, I think the record should show that the Chief of Staff of the Army was General Eisenhower."

At a later point I would certainly bring in the fact, publicized by David Lawrence, that it was President Eisenhower's decision to separate work being done by the Services on intercontinental missiles from work on satellites, and to put emphasis on the former. Short of the actual use of missiles in a shooting war, the public cannot tell how much feet-dragging has been contrived in work on the ICBM, or how far Russia may have stolen and utilized our own developments to be ahead of us in that field too. But her achievement in putting the first earth satellite into orbit was to be

visible to the whole world as a propaganda stunt of immeasurable value. And we think that the overwhelming importance of Eisenhower's scheming and authority, in providing the Communists with this great "victory," could be proved beyond question.

Leaving other large affairs and long-term developments untouched at all, we still wish to crowd in here a few miscellaneous items which demonstrate which way, and how strong, the Eisenhower wind has been blowing. President Remón of Panama, for instance, was a real anti-Communist. Before he was assassinated he had been very strict on Communist agitation; so strict, in fact, that his unpopularity with the Eisenhower administration was obvious. And we have read reports which we believe that our government was holding up Panama's rental on the Panama Canal, as a part of pressures amounting to a blackmail effort, to get Remón to ease up on arrests of Communist spies.

During the Hungarian revolt, and after the anti-Communists despaired of getting the help which they had been led, by Radio Free Europe, to believe we would provide, Franco offered to send arms, provided only that Adenauer would allow Franco's planes to land on West German soil for refueling. Adenauer agreed. With unwonted haste, our State Department went to work immediately to prevent this arrangement from being carried out. And "it took Eisenhower's prestige as President to bring enough pressure to bear on Franco and Adenauer," in order to keep the Hungarian patriots from getting arms through this plan Franco had devised.

With regard to the present mess in the Middle East, we'd like to remind our readers that during the Indochina crisis, while Dienbienphu was still holding out, Eisenhower emphatically and constantly overruled the Pentagon, as to any thoughts of our stepping

in on the side of the anti-Communists. And at the time of the Suez affair, let Intelligence Digest state the case:

"Whereas American pressure on Mr. Ben Gurion to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula was so tremendous (even that word is hardly adequate) and of such a nature as to be virtually irresistible, the Pentagon was not in agreement with the White House. The Pentagon approved of both Israel and Anglo-French military action. The Pentagon well understands the Middle East strategic situation and wants Nasser out. It not only approved but was envious of the recent military moves.

"What the State Department did was President Eisenhower's personal policy. He entirely disregarded the Pentagon's advice. He insists that placation of Nasser is the way to win over the whole Afro-Asian bloc against Russia, and brushes aside any advice to the contrary." (And the article then went on to show how Nasser was working directly for the Soviet all over the Middle East.)

BUT -- in the present crisis, Eisenhower has used the advice of his Joint Chiefs of Staff as his excuse for sending American troops into Lebanon. On July 14 he went through all the motions of listening to a whole afternoon's debate, at a meeting attended by both Dulles brothers, many other officials of the executive branch, and twenty-two Congressional leaders. Two hours later, he ruled for armed intervention, supposedly on the strength of what the Pentagon representatives had advised, against much opposition.

Anybody who thinks this decision really depended on this advice, or was not cut-and-dried before the meeting, or that the meeting itself was anything but sheer window dressing, is showing a naivete that apparently no amount of past experience can dispel. The newspapers, commenting on the "swiftness and smoothness" with which our troops moved into Lebanon, point out that "we were completely alerted and ready. The plans obviously were

already drawn." There is no doubt about that. Eisenhower's Communist bosses had already planned all of the early steps in this new crisis, and their timing, and the bases for all of the usual rash of arguments as to the wisdom of the course -- far in advance.

We have stayed clear of predictions in this document, and we have a healthy respect for James Russell Lowell's advice: "Don't never prophesy unless ye know." But we think the easiest way to show just why Eisenhower's bosses arranged for our present intervention in Lebanon is to look at the inevitable result. It is perfectly obvious that, when "the dust has settled" in the Middle East, four things will have happened:

(1) Our remaining prestige and influence in the Middle East will have been destroyed as completely as was that of France and England, through the "backing down" which we forced on them at the time of the Suez affair.

(2) The prestige of the United Nations, our subservience to the United Nations, and the Kremlin's domination over the United Nations, will all have been immeasurably increased.

(3) Nasser, as a viceroy of the Kremlin, will be in complete and dictatorial power over the whole Arab World.

(4) Western Europe will be supplied the oil, on which its whole economy so heavily depends, on the sufferance and "good will" of Nasser and the Kremlin; and the Kremlin will use this all-decisive weapon as a means of forcing ever more appeasement and "neutralism" on the governments of Western Europe.

It was to bring about these things -- while of course pretending just the opposite -- that Eisenhower landed our marines on the soil of Lebanon.

Winding up this list of maneuvers for which "the word is treason," we ask the reader's forbearance for

one more rotten apple out of the foreign-aid barrel. Right now Eisenhower is vehemently proclaiming that restoration of the 872 million dollars, tentatively cut from what is known as "the President's foreign-aid program," is vital for "fighting Communism." But the little southeastern nation of Laos has been receiving a larger annual per capita share of our foreign aid money than any other country in the world -- forty million dollars per year for its two million inhabitants. According to Eisenhower it would be disastrous to our fight against Communism to slash any part of that sum for Laos scheduled for the coming year. But the man who controls the spending of this American money -- the Minister of Planning and Reconstruction in Laos -- is the open leader of the Communist movement in that country!

It is simply impossible any longer to classify the gift of jet planes to Yugoslavia, or of forty million dollars per year to Laos, as stupidity. This is plain unadulterated treason -- and everybody knows it. But the game has gone so far that nobody knows how to do anything about it. For, as Sir John Harington said long ago, if treason prospers sufficiently, then none dare call it treason. And this certainly applies to those patriots in our government who are well aware of what is happening.

Finally, we'll end this parade with a rather strange exhibit, whose significance is lost on most Americans but well understood by those Europeans it is most intended to impress. This is a booklet, put out by NATO for distribution in Europe, with an excellent picture of Eisenhower on the cover. In the caption under this picture, and also inside the booklet, the title of its hero is given as: Citizen General Eisenhower. This description, going back to the days of the French Revolution for the background of its meaning, very clearly implies to any informed European that the man assuming or ac-

cepting such a title is definitely on the revolutionary side, the Jacobin side, in any struggle between the surging proletariat and the forces of traditionalism. And clearly this booklet, with this caption under the picture on the cover, could not or would not have been put out by NATO without Eisenhower's approval. Standing alone, the episode would mean little. But when added to all of Eisenhower's other actions in Europe, to show his sympathies with the Communist cause and friendship for the Kremlin tyrants, it becomes just one more convincing and discouraging symbol of hopelessness to the Kremlin's enemies.

Standing alone -- as I said in the beginning -- Eisenhower's maneuverings on behalf of the Kremlin, in connection with atomic fuel, with immigration, through NATO, or through any other activity touched on so inadequately in this chapter, could each somehow be explained on the basis of gullibility or idealism or ignorance. But when put together they add up entirely too plainly to another answer.

In September, 1956, Mr. Stanislaw Maskiewicz, a former Premier of the Polish Government-in-Exile, announced sadly that he was returning to Poland. He made it clear that this was not due to any "return home" propaganda of the Moscow line, and that he would remain an ardent anti-Communist as long as he might live. He said simply: "I consider it my duty to return to my native country because America and Britain have betrayed us."

Maskiewicz, though voicing the sentiment of all satellite Europe, was not quite right. The peoples of America and Britain have not betrayed the enslaved peoples of Europe, consciously or intentionally or in any way except through their complacency and ignorance. But Eisenhower, and many men of lesser standing like him in both governments, have deliberately betrayed not only Mr. Maskiewicz's Poland, and the patriots of

Hungary, and the subjugated people of all eastern Europe, including Russia itself; they have equally betrayed, with equal deliberateness and intent, the people of England and America as well. Eisenhower's betrayal to the Communists of his own country, and of the free world it was supposed to be leading, has been so determined, so steady, and so effective, that his purpose seems to me unmistakable.

Several questions will naturally arise in the mind of any normal reader.

The first is, if so many situations within our government are as bad as I have described them, why do not a few good patriotic Americans here and there simply resign, tell the true story, and blow the whole mess wide open? The answer is that they do, constantly.

That is, they resign and tell the story, with complete documentation out of their personal knowledge. And the results are the most discouraging single feature of the whole life-and-death struggle in which we are now engaged. They butt out their brains against a wall of complacency, reinforced by Communist propaganda, and die of broken hearts. From Dr. Wirt in 1934, through Arthur Bliss Lane in 1948, to Bryton Barron in 1956, the role is long and pathetic. The truth, in pieces -- even as large a piece as Arthur Bliss Lane was able to reveal -- gives no terror to the Communists. They smother it with ease, and ruin the man who tells it.

Arthur Bliss Lane, for just one illustration, was an able career man in our diplomatic service, with an impeccable reputation, for thirty years. As our Ambassador to postwar Poland, he saw with his own eyes, lived through, and fully understood, the acts of deliberate treason by which Dean Acheson, Donald Hiss, and others turned over Poland to the Com-

munists. He gave up his career, as a conscious sacrifice, for the specific purpose of telling the truth to the American people. He put that truth in his book, I Saw Poland Betrayed. And neither his sacrifice nor the book created even a ripple.

During the following years Arthur Bliss Lane became a good friend of mine, and has visited in my home. I know what happened to him, and how pathetic was his death. I also know that Dean Acheson and Donald Hiss are both still members of a highly respected law firm in Washington. Their treason has been so glossed over by the opinion-molding rollers of the Communist propaganda machine, and is regarded with such indifference, that the Chairman of the Tax Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce does not have the least scruple about being a partner in the same law firm.

The Communist influence over the total information reaching us through all media, and over the resulting attitudes of the American people, is simply overwhelming; so overwhelming today that a frontal attack against the Communists is like walking head-on into a mowing machine, and has become one of the more unpleasant forms of suicide.

The second question is: Could Eisenhower really be simply a smart politician, entirely without principles and hungry for glory, who is only the tool of the Communists? The answer is yes. With the benefit of comments from friends who have read earlier versions of this document, I have made this revision of the manuscript from that point of view.

For it is obvious that the Communist thinking and planning for Eisenhower's actions, and for the tenor of his public statements, are all done by others. He is only the shell through which the Communist mix of action and propaganda is extruded. He is kept

playing golf, or "on vacation," or otherwise out of the way all that the exigencies of the presidential office will possibly permit. This is for the very purpose of keeping the road clear for actions to be taken and decisions made, in his name, to suit Communist needs -- and without him having to know both the real reason and the specious reason for every detail of what he "does." McCarthy pointed out, what could readily be observed, that frequently "they" had not had a chance to tell Eisenhower what his opinion was on some matter until after his decision had already been announced.

For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own conviction that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I personally think that he has been sympathetic to ultimate Communist aims, realistically willing to use Communist means to help them achieve their goals, knowingly accepting and abiding by Communist orders, and consciously serving the Communist conspiracy, for all of his adult life.

The role he has played, as described above, would fit just as well into one theory as the other; that he is a mere stooge, or that he is a Communist assigned the specific job of being a political front man. In either case the Communists are so powerfully entrenched by now that, even if Eisenhower disappeared from the scene, all the momentum and strength of the forces we have seen at work would still have to be overcome before we would be reasonably out of danger. The firm grip on our government, of the forces that have worked through Eisenhower, is more important than Eisenhower himself. And so long as I can make clear the power and pervasiveness of the conspiracy, as it reaches right inside the White House, I have no wish to quarrel with any reader who finds it easier to believe that Eisenhower is a more personable Harry Truman than

that he is a more highly placed Alger Hiss. For such an interpretation of his conduct brings us out at almost exactly the same point as my own, so far as the disastrous effects on the present and future of our country are concerned.

At this stage of the manuscript, however, perhaps it is permissible for me to take just a couple of paragraphs to support my own belief. And it seems to me that the explanation of sheer political opportunism, to account for Eisenhower's Communist-aiding career, stems merely from a deeprooted aversion of any American to recognizing the horrible truth. Most of the doubters, who go all the way with me except to the final logical conclusion, appear to have no trouble whatever in suspecting that Milton Eisenhower is an outright Communist. Yet they draw back from attaching the same suspicion to his brother, for no other real reason than that one is a professor and the other a president. While I too think that Milton Eisenhower is a Communist, and has been for thirty years, this opinion is based largely on general circumstances of his conduct. But my firm belief that Dwight Eisenhower is a dedicated, conscious agent of the Communist conspiracy is based on an accumulation of detailed evidence so extensive and so palpable that it seems to me to put this conviction beyond any reasonable doubt.

This inevitably prompts the third question, as to how a man born in the American Midwest, who went through the United States Military Academy, could ever become a convert to Communism (or even to the service of Communism for personal glory). The answer, of course, is that very few could, or do. That's why there are probably not more than twenty-five thousand American-born actual Communist traitors in the United States today -- out of a population of 160 million.

These converts are most likely to occur among